

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-15, 17-31, and 33-48 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5-8, 11-15, 17, 21-24, 27-31, 33, 37-40, 43-47 are currently amended.

INTERVIEW

Applicants' appreciate the Examiner's time in conducting an interview with Applicants' attorney. During that interview, certain features of the Wood et al. reference and USP 6,178,511 were discussed, as was Applicants' invention as set forth at claims 1-48, as previously amended. Certain further amendments were also discussed, and it is believed that the interview was constructive in terms of moving the prosecution of the application forward towards allowability and issuance.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 102

Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US patent no. 6,668,322 to Wood et al. Claims 16, 32 and 48 have been cancelled rendering their rejections moot. Each of claims 1-15, 17-31, and 33-48, as now amended, is allowable for the following reason. Wood et al. do not disclose each and every element of any of amended claims 1-15, 17-31 and 33-48.

Specifically, amended claim 1 now recites storing at the enterprise server multiple security credentials for a remote user to access respective secure resources residing on a network employing a generic application layer network protocol; maintaining a map between one or more resource servers and a type of security credential required to access each resource server; receiving at the enterprise server a signal representing a first request from a remote user for a first of the secure resources ...; determining, by referring to the map and without the intervention of the user, the type of security credential for the remote user that is required to access the first secure resource; and sending from the server a

signal representing a second request to retrieve the first secure resource, the second request including a first of the security credentials for the user of the type required to access the first secure resource.

As understood, Wood et al. do not disclose the element “storing multiple security credentials …”, nor the element “maintaining a map …”, as recited completely at Applicants’ amended claim 1 (see above).

Moreover, the Examiner has cited column 9, lines 65-67 and column 10, lines 1-29 of Wood et al. as meeting the determining element of Applicants’ original claim 1. This disclosure by Wood et al. does not teach that the security credential is for the remote user. Instead, Wood et al. describes how an entry handler component 110 ascertains much of the requesting clients environment information, such as line speed and low-level encryption, source number, signaling type, source network or node, VPN, connect location and time, etc. It is respectfully submitted that the described information about the environment of a requesting client is not a type of security credential for a remote user that is required to access a secure resource. Moreover, at column 10, lines 38-39, Wood et al. teach that data is supplied to the client entity for use in uniquely identifying an associated session, thus involving user intervention.

The Examiner has further cited column 12, lines 66-67 and column 13, lines 1-20 of Wood et al. as meeting the sending element of Applicants’ original claim 1. This disclosure by Wood et al. does not teach that a second signal representing a second request to the secure resource is sent from the server, wherein the second request includes the required security credential as determined without the intervention of the user. Instead, Wood et al. teaches that browser 170 sends login component a new access request. As understood, browser 170 resides at the client, and thus Wood et al.’s new access request including session token (col. 13, line 4) is sent from the client. Moreover, at column 10, lines 51-56, Wood et al. teach that session tokens are issued to client entities, which is consistent with the teaching at columns 12-13 that browser 170 (which is resident on a client, not a server) sends new access requests including session tokens.

Appl. No. 10/004,301
Amendment dated November 9, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed September 13, 2005

Claims 2-15, as now amended, are allowable at least as being dependent from amended claim 1. Claims 17 and 33, as now amended, are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 18-31, as now amended, are allowable at least as being dependent from amended claim 17. Claims 34-47, as now amended, are allowable at least as being dependent from amended claim 33. For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner's reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 07-1896. A duplicate page is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP

Dated: November 9, 2005

By


Andrew V. Smith
Reg. No. 43,132
Attorney for Applicant

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP
153 Townsend Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94107
Telephone: 415-836-2522
Facsimile: 415-836-2501

Customer No.: 29585

Appl. No. 10/004,301
Amendment dated November 9, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed September 13, 2005



Claims 2-15, as now amended, are allowable at least as being dependent from amended claim 1. Claims 17 and 33, as now amended, are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 18-31, as now amended, are allowable at least as being dependent from amended claim 17. Claims 34-47, as now amended, are allowable at least as being dependent from amended claim 33. For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner's reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 07-1896. A duplicate page is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP

Dated: November 9, 2005

By _____

AVS
Andrew V. Smith
Reg. No. 43,132
Attorney for Applicant

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP
153 Townsend Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94107
Telephone: 415-836-2522
Facsimile: 415-836-2501

Customer No.: 29585